

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SENSITIVE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

REFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Rhode Island Republican State Central Committee and)	
Merrill C. Drew, as treasurer)	MUR 5369
Lincoln Chafee for U.S. Senate and William R. Facente,)	
as treasurer)	

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY A. SMITH AND COMMISSIONERS MICHAEL E. TONER AND DAVID M. MASON

I. Introduction

This statement provides the basis for the Commission's 4-2 vote¹ to find no reason to believe that the Rhode Island Republican Party ("RIRP") and Merrill C. Drew, as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a)(2)(A) and 441a(f); no reason to believe that Lincoln Chafee for U.S. Senate and William R. Facente, as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f); and no reason to believe that the Rhode Island Republican Party² and Merrill C. Drew, as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b). Accordingly, the Commission determined to close the file in this matter.

II. <u>Background</u>

On May 23, 2001, the Reports Analysis Division, as part of its regular review of reports filed by political committees during the 2000 election cycle.³ sent the RIRP a routine

¹ Chair Ellen L. Weintraub, Vice Chairman Bradley A. Smith, and Commissioners Michael E. Toner and David M. Mason voted in favor of the motion, and Commissioners Danny L. McDonald and Scott E. Thomas voted against the motion.

² The committee is registered with the Federal Election Commission as the Rhode Island Republican State Central Committee.

The activity in question occurred before enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-155, 116 Stat. 81 (2002) The activity was governed by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"), and the regulations in effect at the time. Thus, all references to the Act and Commission regulations exclude changes required by BCRA. With respect to the activity at issue here, those changes are described in the Final Rules for the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002; Coordinated and Independent Expenditures, 68 Fed. Reg. 404 (Jan. 3, 2003) (codified at 11 C.F.R. pts. 100, et al.). On May 2, 2003, a three-judge panel of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that a number of BCRA provisions are unconstitutional but later stayed its order and injunction that had enjoined the enforcement, execution, or other application of the provisions. The case will be argued before the U.S. Supreme Court on September 8, 2003. McConnell v. FEC, 251 F. Supp. 2d 176 (D.D.C. 2003), probable jurisdiction noted, 123 S.Ct. 2268 (2003).

request for further information with respect to certain disbursements for media costs.⁴ In response to a follow-up request, RIRP explained that the costs were for uncoordinated expenditures for a federal election. Under established policy, the matter was then referred to the Office of the General Counsel, and, after review, that Office presented its theory to the Commission that the RIRP had engaged in potentially-coordinated non-express advocacy communications because the party and the candidate used the same media strategist and two advertisements contained similar themes and language.

II. Facts and Analysis

The candidate's authorized committee and the RIRP disclosed payments to McAuliffe Message Media/Pilgrim Films (apparently part of the same entity) during the relevant time period.⁵ The two advertisements cited for their similarity were "Tradition" and "Undaunted." "Tradition" was paid for by RIRP:

For Lincoln Chafee, hard work, integrity, and caring for others aren't just political slogans — they're a tradition. Senator Lincoln Chafee puts those values to work every day. For a social security lock box that stops politicians from raiding the trust fund. Ending the marriage tax penalty on working couples. He voted against his own party for a real patients' bill of rights and a prescription drug benefit that gives seniors the drugs they need at a price they can afford. Tell Senator Chafee to keep up his independent fight for Rhode Island.

"Undaunted" was paid for by the Lincoln Chafee for U.S. Senate Committee:

A man of reason and moderation, independent minded and forward looking, Senator Lincoln Chafee's character and leadership is working for Rhode Island. A sense of duty and exemplary executive experience, Chafee knows how to get things done. Undaunted in his efforts – protecting our environment, pushing for a patients' bill of rights, Medicare prescription drug coverage for all beneficiaries. A man of conviction, a leader. Senator Lincoln Chafee – a tradition of trust.

The Act provides that state political party committees may make coordinated expenditures, within certain limits. 2 U.S.C. § 441a(d). In addition, state party committees may make independent expenditures on behalf of federal candidates without limit. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. FEC, 518 U.S. 604 (1996). The Commission's view of the relevant standards governing the subject advertisements has been amply described

⁴ Attached are portions of the RIRP disclosure report in which the disbursements at issue appear, Attachment 1, and the RIRP's response to the Reports Analysis Division's inquiry, Attachment 2.

⁵ See Lincoln Chafee for U.S. Senate, 2000 October Quarterly Report dated Oct. 12, 2000, Sched. B for Line 17 at 8-9; RIRP, 2000 October Quarterly Report dated Oct. 5, 2000, Sched. B. for Line 21b at 1-2.

in numerous statements.⁶ It is precisely because of the notice, fairness and consistency concerns identified in these statements and the cumulative history of the Commission's treatment of similarly-situated respondents that the Commission voted to find no reason to believe that violations had occurred and to close the file in this matter.

As a result of the disposition of cases arising during past election cycles, parties and candidates operated under a de facto Commission policy of not treating non-express advocacy communications by political parties as coordinated expenditures. In 1999, addressing matters from the 1996 election cycle, the Commission rejected by a 2-4 vote recommendations by its audit staff to treat non-express advocacy advertisements by national political parties featuring the party's presidential nominee (or opponent) as coordinated expenditures on behalf of the nominee despite substantial evidence of extensive cooperation between the party and the nominee in crafting and disseminating the communications. The four Commissioners who voted to reject the recommendation explained that they did so because the "electioneering message" test relied upon in the audits and accompanying legal analyses was impermissibly vague, overbroad and had not been properly promulgated by the Commission, thus leaving parties without notice as to what sort of communications (other than express advocacy) might be treated as coordinated contributions if made in cooperation with a campaign.

Subsequently, by a 3-3 vote with a substantially different alignment of Commissioners, the Commission refused to initiate enforcement proceedings with respect to these rejected audit findings. Those Commissioners declining to go forward again cited vagueness, overbreadth and, by that point, inconsistency with the Commission's own actions

⁶ Statement of Reasons in MURs 4568, et al. (Triad) of Commissioner Mason (Jan. 22, 2003); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4538 (Alabama Republican Party et al.) of Commissioners Mason and Smith (May 23, 2002); Supplemental Statement of Reasons in MUR 4994 (Clinton for Senate et al.) of Commissioner Smith (Jan. 17, 2002); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4994 (Hillary Rodham Clinton for U.S. Senate, et al.) of Commissioner Thomas (Dec. 19, 2001); Statement for the Record in MUR 4624 (The Coalition) of Commissioner Smith (Nov. 6, 2001); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4624 of Commissioners Thomas and McDonald (Sept. 7, 2001); Supplemental Statement of Reasons in MUR 4553, et al. (Dole/Clinton) of Commissioner Thomas (May 25, 2000); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4578, et al (Dole/Clinton) of Commissioner Thomas (May 25, 2000); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4378 (Rehberg) of Commissioners Wold, Elliott, and Mason (Oct. 28, 1999); Statement of Reasons in MUR 4378 (Rehberg) of Commissioners Thomas and McDonald (Aug. 10, 1999); Statement of Reasons in the Audits of Dole for President, Inc. (Primary), et al. of Commissioners Wold, Elliott, Mason, and Sandstrom (June 24, 1999).

⁷ See Statement of Reasons in MUR 4994 (Hillary Rodham Clinton for U.S. Senate, et al.) of Commissioner Thomas (Dec. 19, 2001) ("at the time the activity in question was occurring, the parties and candidates could not have had a clear picture of whether their plans would be treated as a violation of the coordinated expenditure limits").

⁸ Statement of Reasons of Commissioners Wold, Elliott, Mason, and Sandstrom in the Audits of "Dole for President Committee, Inc. (Primary), et al. of Commissioners Wold, Elliott, Mason and Sandstrom (June 24, 1999).

⁹ This test is different from the electioneering communications definition subsequently adopted by Congress in BCRA.

in the audit.¹⁰ Still later, in matters arising from the 1996 and 1998 election cycles, the Commission rejected a series of probable cause recommendations from its General Counsel alleging that various state political parties had made excessive coordinated contributions to the Senate nominees when the parties made non-express advocacy communications in cooperation with the nominees. In one case from the 1998 election cycle, the Commission found that a party had made excessive coordinated communications on behalf of a nominee but restricted these findings to the party's express advocacy communications.¹¹

On August 2, 1999 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that the Commission's coordination regulation was unconstitutional. Rather than seek review of the ruling the Commission repealed the subject rule and promulgated a new coordination regulation. When it enacted BCRA, Congress repealed the post-Christian Coalition regulation and directed the Commission to promulgate yet another coordination regulation. This series of events only further muddied the waters as to what sorts of communications by political parties might constitute coordinated expenditures.

By the 2000 election cycle, the Commission was rejecting even investigating allegations involving alleged coordination of non-express advocacy party communications. While Commissioners diverged in some degree on their rationales, all agreed that "at the time the activity in question was occurring, the parties and candidates could not have had a clear picture of whether their plans would be treated as a violation of the coordinated expenditure limits." Having rejected a complaint involving party advertising in the 2000 election on this basis in December of 2001, it would have been wholly arbitrary and capricious for the Commission in June of 2003 to change course and proceed under a theory of law which it had consistently rejected over the four previous years.

As previously explained, "[t]he Commission's uncertain policy guidance and the absence of consistent enforcement policy have, separately or together, made it impossible for the Commission to cite political parties for coordinating non-express advocacy

¹⁰ MURs 4969, 4970, and 4713.

¹¹ MUR 4503 (South Dakota Democratic Party).

¹² FEC v. Christian Coalition, 52 F. Supp.2d 45, 89 (D.D.C. 1999)(referring to prior version of 11C.F.R. § 109.1(b)(4)).

^{13 65} Fed. Reg. 76138 (Dec. 6, 2000) (codified later at 11 C.F.R. § 100.23).

¹⁴ Section 214(c) of BCRA provides, "The Federal Election Commission shall promulgate new regulations on coordinated communications paid for by persons other than candidates, authorized committees of candidates, and party committees. The regulations shall not require agreement or formal collaboration to establish coordination..." The Commission promulgated the new regulations in Final Rules for the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002; Coordinated and Independent Expenditures, 68 Fed. Reg. 404 (Jan. 3, 2003) (codified at 11 C.F.R. pts. 100, et al.).

¹⁵ Statement of Reasons in MUR 4994 (Hillary Rodham Clinton for U.S. Senate, et al.) of Commissioner Thomas (Dec. 19, 2001).

communications with candidates." If parties and candidates were not on notice of the Commission's interpretation of the relevant statutes and regulations, as a matter of "hornbook law in the administrative context" the Commission has no basis to pursue Respondents in this matter. The regulated community thus had no fair warning of Commission enforcement policy in such matters and traditional concepts of due process preclude the imposition of penalties. 19

There is now an additional reason for the Commission to decline to dedicate resources for the pre-November 2002 coordinated expenditure allegations at issue here. As explained above, both the "content" (whether the relevant category of communications is restricted to or extends beyond express advocacy and how far beyond) and the "conduct" (Christian Coalition, BCRA) legs of the Commission's coordinated communications concept have been subject to disagreement and shifting interpretation. In BCRA, Congress specifically included certain non-express advocacy communications in the class of potentially-coordinated communications, and the Commission added additional content standards pursuant to a specific regulatory mandate from Congress. Whatever the law should have been prior to November 2002, it has substantially changed now, and there would be no value whatsoever in pursuing a test case (or making a declaration through a reason-to-believe finding without further proceedings) as to whether particular communications may have violated the vague standards in effect prior to BCRA.

Furthermore, the information available to the Commission is not suggestive of coordination and therefore fails the reason-to-believe threshold. The text of "Tradition" and "Undaunted" contain immaterial similarities reasonably attributed to the common sense conclusion that most parties and candidates will be addressing a defined set of campaign issues in their advertising. The Commission has no legal basis to assign a legal consequence to these similarities without specific evidence of prior coordination with regard to the specific content, timing and placement of the advertisements. Although both committees itemized disbursements to the same media firm, this fact speaks weakly to the burden of proof the

¹⁶ Statement of Reasons in MUR 4538 (Alabama Republican Party) of Commissioners Mason and Smith (May 23, 2002) at 7.

¹⁷ General Elec. Co. v. EPA, 53 F.3d 1324, 1329 (D.D.C. 1995)(citing Rollins Environmental Services (NJ) Inc., v. U.S., 937 F.2d 649, 655 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 1991)(Edwards, J., dissenting in part and concurring in part)).

¹⁸ Commissioner Smith has argued that prior to BCRA "coordinated spending by party committees does not become subject to the Act's limits on contributions unless it contains express advocacy." Supplemental Statement of Reasons in MUR 4994 (Hillary Rodham Clinton for U.S. Senate, et al.) of Commissioner Smith (Jan. 17, 2002) at 9. Commissioner Toner concurs with Commissioner Smith's conclusion of law on this issue. Because the RIRP's "Tradition" advertisement lacks express advocacy, for this additional reason Commissioners Smith and Toner voted to find no reason to believe.

¹⁹ Satellite Broadcasting Co., Inc. v. FCC, 824 F.2d 1, 3 (D.C. Cir. 1987)("Traditional concepts of due process incorporated into administrative law preclude an agency from penalizing a private party for violating a rule without first providing adequate notice of the substance of the rule."); U.S. Const. amend. V.

^{20 2} U.S.C. § 441a(a)(7)(C); 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c).

Commission has when it seeks to prove coordination. Given the history of the Commission's disposition of previous matters and this generalized and unfocused factual support, the Commission voted to find no reason to believe that violations occurred and closed the file in this matter.

August 15, 2003

Bradley A. Smith

Vice Chairman

David M. Mason

Commissioner

Michael E. Toner

Commissioner

REPORT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSE	MENTS		
For Other Then An Authorized Committee (Summary Page)	RECEN FEC MAIL	/ED	
J! 1. NAME OF CONMITTEE (In MI)	MAN and a		
RI Republican State Central	Comm. (SEE OCT 16	P 241	
S C VDDIJEBB (empth year street) Prest I despes see haarseld i	reponed		
551 South Main Street	2. FECIDENT FIGHT		
CITY, STATE and ZIP CODE		79196 Nata specification and idea	
Providence, RI 02903		OO PEG FORM THE	
TH 4 TYPE OF REPORT			
(4) (a) April 15 Country Perpart	Monthly Report Due On:		
U July 16 Coursely Report	February 20 June August August	20 November 20	
Colober 15 Querterly Report	May 80 Appts	ember 20 [] January -37	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12-Day Pre-Baction Report 60	f the figure at Electricity	
July 21 Mid Year Peoport (Non-election Year Only)	election on	- -	
 }	S0-Day Post-Election Report (Collegeing the General Wilection	
Termination Report	_	•	
Commission report	, .	Me ()	
a. 7 (b) is this Report on Amendment? YES NO .			
SUMMARY D. L. C.	COLUMN A	COLUMN ES	
8. Covering Period 7-1-00 shrough 9-30-00	Title Period	Calendar Year-to-Date	
6. (a) Cash on Hand January L. 18		\$ 5161.55 -	
(b) Cash on Hand all Beginning of Peppring Peded	\$ 18,914. 81		
(t) Total Receipts (from Line 19)	\$ 212, 320. 85	\$ 299,400, 45	
(d) Subtaint (add Lines S(t) and S(t) for Column A and Lines S(t) and S(d) for Column 3)	\$ 231 235. bb	\$ 304, 568. 28	
•	* 187 3ag °c	\$ 255,654.13	
7. Total Dispursaments (from Line 30)	6 46 600 44		
Ceen on Hand at Class of Fluporting Pethod (author); Line 7 from Line 8(d) Debts and Obligations Owed TO the Committee	s 43,707.	Fortuna interestions contact	
(Annize all en Schedule C ensior Schedule D)		Podrail Excelon Compraints sion 800 E Street, NW	
(hernize all on Schedule C andler Schedule D)	\$ 32, 125. 94	Washington, DC 2018 3	
I certify that I have exemined this Report and to the best of my impulses and complete.	age end Dener II is true, coltrect	Leni 222-604-1203	
Type or Prist Name of Transver C. Cockolisis			
Signature of Treadurer		Dete	
Fignature of Treasurer Thurseat C. Couplin		11-5-00	
NOTE: Submission of false, erroneous, or incomplete information may subject the	person signing this Report to the p	Brakies of 2 U.S.C. §437 g.	
		FEC FORM 3X	
1 1 . 1		(revised £60)	

ATTACHMENT T

HEDULE 5

ITEMIZED DISBURBEMENTS

Live expands schedule(sgfor mathesisting of the Dutaling Burnings Prope

PORLINE NUMBER 21 6

ny interpretion capital from such Reports and Sustaments may not be exid or used by any purson for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for commission appears, other using the name and address of any political commisses to exist contributions from such commisses.

	AI Republican State Central Committee			
	A. Pull Hann, Melling Address and 201 Code	Purpose of Englishment	Date (mortile,	Import of Each Distrement This Posted
4	Philadelphia Massiett Mashey sheet Philadelphia 84	Convenien he tell Disconnectiff Pennsy Consti	7/00/10	706.56
7	B. Fell Name, Melbry Address and 219 Code Town Of Sanithfield	Purpose of Distansonard	Date (travelle, day, year)	Atters of Each Distance of Fish Posted
	SMITH eld, RE 02717 Grating Adding Address and Est Conto	Claim (speedly) Purpose of Distorcements	Date (Menilla,	AS. **
	100 100	COnvention girlace Districted to: Printy George Total freedy	767/05	397.40
M	B. Pati Name, Malling Address and 21P Oute AT +T PO Sox 371430	Purpose of Disbuttes more Telephane Disbuttered to: Printery General	Dute (month), day, year) 8/25/05	Americal Earth Decement Thron Period 1642.53
	Mellon, Re 15250 a full Herne, Mellong Accessor and 217 Code M. Ruliffe Media	Proposed Districtions Religions Districtions Religions Districtions Property General	Cate (mpryin, ds, year) 5/21 to	Arcord of Brack Dishropped This Pedas §5,000 21,810
	Providence Mainthe Delication and ZIP Code Providence Mainth One Orns Stept Providence RE Cognit	Purpose of Distancement C 210April 7 COST 5 Distancement for Primary General Other (specify)	Com (nontr. Cay, year)	Amount of Black Disturband This Period 501, 34
	9. Pull Name, Malling Address and 219 Code STOTE OF Rhade Island 100 S- Maca Street Princepale, 85 02903	Puspesse of District Contract	Date (morati, day, year)	Amount of Each Distributed This Period
	n. Fill Hans, William address and 200 Com. Town as flop kingle? Town Hall Hallerman, AC 62817	Perpass of Dabursonners Votel File; Dabursoners for Frinary General Observations	Date (mongh, day, year)	Angual of Breigh Discussions Trees Period 15.
	L Pull Nome, and ing Address and IF code Town of Joines 1640 1044 Hall Janes 1641	Perpose of Dinbursament Voter File Disbursament for: Primary General Other Japadity	Constanting day: year; 8/7/os 8/15/10	Ament of Each Distraction Trice Period 25, 00 2, 50
,	OTAL of Disburgements This Page (optional)			109,000. 73
,	L This Period (less page the line number only)		A	TACEMENT /

-		æ	8
	L	8	

TEMIZED DISBURSEMENTS

Use asphesio eshedzalejaji lar eashesiagory el tibis Desiled Sustany Page

FORLING NUMBER

y information copied from such Reports and Statements may not be cold or used by any person for the purpose of solicity cross-libutions of the commercial species, other than using the name and address of any political committee to contributions from such committee.

MAIS OF CONSUTTER (or Pull)				
Az Republican State Central Committee				
A. Full Name, Malling Address and 20° Code	Purpose of Dinburgement	Date (month.	Arest of Eath	
Town of Parsimouth	Voter Files	My, 9001)	Distriction This Partid	
Trous Hell	Districtment for: Pamery General	8/7/00	محد ہو	
POITSMOITH, AT OUTIL	Contractor	1170	<i>7.</i> ·	
S. Pull Name, Maline Address and 200 Code	Purpose of Cinimum PACA	Dete (eartite,	Agent of Each	
Rednel Games STRPLES	Printer Punture	69. (651)	Debusinens This Pened	
SEI N. MEIN IT	miling Cons	الما	112,32	
Providence, H OMOL	Disbusyers for Primary Gamen	9/12/1-	1166,	
	Crear (specify)		•	
C. Pell Home, Malling Address and ESP Code	Propose of Disburgement	gat, hort). Date (taugh)	Artists of Bases Debugged The Perfor	
Redered Gaptes 5	mailing cours	9/11/00	12.82	
160 Westminster St	Dishumarates for: Parany General	ahijeo	15 52	
Providence LT 61903	Other (specify)	of fee	158.50	
17 D. Sull Home, Meditor Address and 217 Code	Purpose of Disburgument	Cate Incolle.	Areat of Each	
Town OF Schools	Vote File	Gay, year)	Discount This Period	
195 Danieson Pike	Distrument for Person General	9/12/00	30. °C	
ideate PT BUFFF7	Cher (medity)		<i>50</i> ,	
E. Pull Repris, Melling Address and 22° Code	Purpose of Discoursement	Dete (nonth,	Amort of Each	
WHEN Roel Estate	herr.	day, year)	Distributed This Petiod	
126 High Street		9/7/60	1100 00	
1 A *	Disbustanti for: Parety General	.,,,,,	1000.	
From Mana, Malling Address and ZP Cools	Other (specify) Purpose of Disburgament	Ontri Grantin		
Pilquin Films	- Aches a Decoration .	Osto (recrific Car, year)	Affect of Buch Districted This Petiod	
Le dille bille	Proposition Costs	11		
·	Disburgament for: Primary General	9/11/10	8572 50	
	Oller (specify)			
G. Full Home, Mailing Address and 23P Gods	Perpose of Chimurgers est	Date (month), day, year)	Attend of Earth Distriction This Period	
Bell Atlantic	Teliphone			
PO 601 968	District for Printry Gerand	9/7/00	248.63	
Providence, At 02501	Corner (specify)			
H, Pull Name, Malling Address and ESP Cage	Purpose of Disburgament	Denv (monUn.	Anest of Esch	
190 Veseminseer Sheet	Bank Charges	7/31/00	Distancent This Point	
190 Veseminster Street	District Prince General	9/4/06		
Projector to 02503	Ogner (specify)	Malor	55.50	
L Pull Remp, Madina Adhesa and 21P Codo	Perpose of Disburgarium	Date (econgr.	Amount of Each	
Fleer bank 100 Eupsimuisier staet	Baire Charges	gjirj Do bel kon j	Publication This Portor	
100 Wesomiaster Street			25, 90	
Providence, # 02903	Disburgement lot: Primary Gerardi Other (specify)	9/29/00	n. 95	
·	1 17			
✓ FAL of DisbursementsThis Page (optional)				
and falsening entering the second			10,259.25	
ATT CEVENT				
L This Period (least page this line number only)				

RECEIVED FEC HAIL ROOM

2801 JUL -6 A 10: 32

291 SOUTH MAIN STREET
PROMODENCE, R.L. 822825
PHONE: (401) 453-4100 • FAX: (401) 453-0066

July 2, 2001

Federal Election Commission Reports Analysis Division c/o Colleen Manning 999 E Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20463

Dear Collegn:

23.04.406.1818

This letter serves as the Rhode Island Republican State Central Committee's (C00078196) response to the Commission's inquiry regarding the October Quarterly Report (7/1/00-9/30/00).

1. On Schedule B, the questioned expenditures made for "Production/Ad Time and Production Costs" should have read:

Page 1 of 3. Line E

McAuliffe Message Media 336 Commerce Street Alexandrie, VA 22314

Purpose of Disbursement: Uncoordinated Expenditure for Federal Level Election

Candidate: U.S. Senator Lincoln Chaftee P.O. Box 7629 Warwick, RI 02889

i of 3

ATTACHMENT 2
Page ____ of 3

RECEIVED FEC HALL ROOM

2001 JUL -6 A 10: 32

Page 2 of 3 Line F

Pilgrim Films Black Horse Lana Cohasset, MA 02025

Purpose of Disbursement: Uncoordinated Expenditure for Federal Level Election

Candidate: U.S. Senator Lincoln Chafee P.O. Box 7629 Warwick, RI 02289

2. On Schedule H (4), the itemized disbursement in question should have read:

Page 6 of 7, Line B

Bernard A. Jackvony

100 Fegwin Drive

East Greenwich, RI 02818

Purpose of Disbursement: Expenses-Reimbursement for Travel to RNC Meeting

3. On Schedule H (4) supporting Line 21(a)(i), the correct addresses are as follows:

Page 5 of 7. Line B Tim Bonin 42 Sandy Glen Drive Halden, MA 01520

Page 5 of 7. Line D.

Paychex, Inc.

501 Wamponoag Trail

East Providence, RI 02914

Page 5 of 7. Line 12
Paychex, Inc.
501 Wamponoeg Trail
East Providence, RI 02914

2 of 3

Page 5 of 7. Line F
Paychest, Inc.
501 Warmponung Trail
East Providence, RI 02914

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact race. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chatte W. Bucci Jr.

Tressurer

(